

REMARKS

Applicants request that the Examiner acknowledge the claim to priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and also receipt of the certified copy of the priority document submitted with the application on March 17, 2004.

Claim Rejections

In the office action dated July 26, 2006, the examiner rejected claims 16-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. PG Pub. No. 2002/0155740 to Sawada *et al.* ("Sawada"). In the subsequent advisory action dated November 16, 2006, the Examiner indicated that item 29A in Fig. 4 of Sawada's invention was broadly interpreted as the second engagement portion being *adapted to* have the flexible wired board (item 36, Fig. 4) arranged therein, as recited in Applicants' claim 16. Applicants have amended claim 16.

Applicants' respectfully submit that Sawada does not disclose or suggest at least the second engagement portion having said connecting member arranged therein, as recited in amended claim 16. The Examiner alleges that Sawada discloses this feature at paragraphs 0042-0046 and Fig. 4.

Sawada, however, merely discloses that flexible wired board 36 is led out from board 29A of first apparatus 29 to board 31A of second apparatus 31 (paragraph 0045; Fig. 4). Sawada does not disclose the manner or mechanism by which the flexible wired board 36 is led out from the first apparatus 29 through coupling device 21 to the second apparatus 31. Therefore, even under a broad interpretation, Sawada does not disclose an element corresponding to the second

engagement portion (Application Fig. 8, 202) having said connecting member (Application Fig. 8, 106) arranged therein, as recited in the claim.

On the other hand, Applicants' claim is supported in the specification and drawings. Applicants' Fig. 8 is an exploded view illustrating the second engagement portion 202 and the connecting member 106 arranged therein.

Since the Examiner has not established the structure of Sawada corresponding to the second engagement portion having said connecting member arranged therein as set forth in claim 16, Sawada does not anticipate the claim. Therefore, claim 16 is patentable over Sawada. Claims 17-39, which depend from claim 16, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
Application No. 10/801,575

Atty. Docket No. Q78525

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis G. Plati, Sr.
Registration No. 59,135

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 26, 2006